

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Office Action mailed March 28, 2008, claims 1 – 4, 6 – 8, and 10 – 15 were allowed, claims 9 and 16 were rejected, and claim 5 was objected to. In response, Applicants have amended claims 5, 9, and 16 and added new claim 17. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of and determination that claims 1 – 4, 6 – 8, and 10 – 15 are allowed.

### Objections to the Drawings

The current application is a U.S. National Stage application. The drawing requirements for U.S. National Stage applications are identified in MPEP 1825 and labeling of figures as "Prior Art" is not required (see PCT Rule 11.11). Further, MPEP 1893.03(f) states that "[t]he USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11)." In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that labeling Figure 1 as "Prior Art" is not required in the current application.

### Objections to the Specification

The Office Action also suggests that section headings be added to the specification, according to the guidelines set forth in the MPEP. Applicants note that the suggested section headings are not required and, hence, Applicants respectfully decline to amend the specification to include the indicated section headings.

The disclosure is objected to because of various informalities. In one case, the Office action states that on page 4, line 3, the word "of" is incorrectly written as "or." Applicants have reviewed this paragraph and respectfully assert that the word "or" is correct. Applicants point to paragraph [0013] for additional support for use of the word "or."

Paragraph [0045] is amended to recite “de-serializer 36” instead of “serializer 36.”

Paragraphs [0016] – [0025] are amended to remove reference to claim numbers.

#### Claim Objections

Claim 5 was objected to because of the word “second.” Applicants have amended claim 5 to remove the word “second.”

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 9 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 8 instead of claim 6. Claim 8 provides antecedent basis for the terms “said minimum” and “said maximum.”

Claim 16 has been amended to remove reference to “a packet switch according to claim 10.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

#### New Claim

New claim 17 is similar to claim 16, as originally filed, except that new claim 17 only depends on claim 10 and not claim 1. Applicants assert that new claim 17 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: June 26, 2008

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111